

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in a condition for allowance in view of the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claim 12 and 13 are objected because they do not have amendment status. Corresponding correction has been made to correct the informalities. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection due to the amendment.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 25-29 and 31-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0055710 to Aoki et al. (hereinafter "Aoki") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,266,771 to Tow et al. (hereinafter "Tow") and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0034868 to Fukuoka (hereinafter "Fukuoka").

Rejection to claims 1 and 8

Claim 1 and 8 are independent claims about a method and system for content recording of a personal video recorder, and were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki in view of Tow and Fukuoka. The applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 and the amendment is based on [0027] in the specification, which states that the system may perform compaction on scene segments, i.e., the system moves scene segments into a signal contiguous block of memory and so as to create continuous free space. This function is not mentioned in Aoki, Tow, or Fukuoka, thus, the applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 to specify the difference between cited references and claims 1 and 8, and this function not only provides free *continuous*

space for future use but also further enhance the convenience of the user. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Rejection to claims 2-6, 9-13, and 29-33

Claims 2-6, 9-13, and 29-33 depend from claims 1 and 8, and applicant respectfully submits the traverse of this rejection regarding to the patentability of the independent claims 1 and 8.

Rejection to claim 15

Claim 15 is about a method for content recording of a personal video recorder, and were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the reasons discussed below but has amended the claim 15 to further specify the difference. The amendment is based on [0019] in the specification and Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added.

The Examiner pointed out that “Aoki discloses a system with corresponding method for content recording of a personal video recorder.” However, through Claim 15, there is no trace of claiming a *system*. Furthermore, claim 15 is a method claim, and alternately, the cited paragraphs [0190]-[0192] and Fig. 1 in Aoki disclose “[a] motion picture storage *apparatus* produces a viewing history of the user from the information which has been stored in a periodic manner, or a arbitrary timing, and then stores produced viewing history.” Fig. 1 in Aoki includes a motion picture analyzing unit, a condition storage unit, and request receiving/control unit. Though Fig. 1 may imply the step of “receiving a broadcast program,” or the step of “storing said broadcast program on a hard disk,” people of ordinary skill in the art may not be able to put the functions of the units into logical order and would not be able to understand the interaction thereof.

Moreover, the cited paragraphs [0190]-[0192] only disclose a segment that “contents to be produced correspond to such information, such as file name, status, and viewing section.” That might be analog to the step in the method, which is “employing a record of said associated

database table that contains a start address field, an end address field, a user preference field generated from said user preference signal, and a show name field,” but Applicant respectfully disagrees that using *buttons* in Fig. 10 to analogize the steps. For example, the Office Action stated that the step of “determining a user preference by said user preference signal supplied through a user interface device wherein said user preference signal comprises a viewed signal, a skipped signal and an unviewed signal” is taught by Fig.10, and “wherein said unviewed scene segment is virtually divided on said hard disk, and updating said associated database table in accordance with said user preference” is taught by elements 1304-2 and 1304-4 in Fig. 10.

Admittedly, Akoi discloses that the viewing history storage unit uses a method to manipulate the apparatus thereof. However, the method in Akoi (hereinafter “Akoi method”) does not disclose the steps of “receiving a user preference signal via a user interface, said user preference signal comprising a skipped signal indicating a scene segment of said broadcast program was skipped by a user during playback” and “generating an associated database table based upon said user preference signal received...” Please refer to paragraph [0260] to [0266] and Fig. 11 in Akoi. Though Akoi teaches establishing a history database by setting the viewing history data, such as “has been viewed”, “scan viewing”, or “viewing with interest,” the way Akoi establishing the history database is evaluating whether the ratio of total time range of viewed portions against that of entire duration is larger, smaller than a *predetermined threshold value*. Besides, Akoi even defines the situation that the ratio of total time range of viewed portions against that of entire duration is equal to a *predetermined threshold value*. Hence, the comparison between the signal and the predetermined threshold is different from the steps disclosed in claim 15. In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claim 15 is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested.

Rejection to claims 18 and 19

Claims 18 and 19 are depend from claims 15, besides, claim 19 has been amended to further specify the difference between prior art and claim 18, which is claim 19 specific states

that “determining a starting point of a rewind scene segment in which said user wants to start replaying by using remote control or key board.” Neither of the cited references specially teaches the control interface. In light of at least one reason above, applicant respectfully submits the traverse of this rejection regarding to the patentability of the independent claims 15.

Rejection to claim 25

Claim 25 is an independent claim about a method for content recording of a personal video recorder, and was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki in view of Tow and Fukuoka. The applicant has amended claim 25 and the amendment is based on [0027] in the specification, which states that the system may perform compaction on scene segments, i.e., the system moves scene segments into a signal contiguous block of memory and so as to create continuous free space. This function is not mentioned in Aoki, Tow, or Fukuoka, thus, the applicant has amended claim 25 to specify the difference between cited reference and claim 25, and this function not only provide free *continuous* space for future use but also further enhance the convenience of the user. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Rejection to claims 26-28

Claims 26-28 depend from claim 25, and applicant respectfully submits the traverse of this rejection regarding to the patentability of the independent claim 25.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our
Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. ACER-45195.

Dated: January 13, 2010

By: /Michael A. Shimokaji/
Michael A. Shimokaji, Reg. No. 32303

SHIMOKAJI & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
8911 Research Drive
Irvine, CA 92618
(949) 788-9961